

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

The specification has been carefully reviewed and the minor typographical error on page 1 has been corrected. Although the specification may not have been written as artfully as it might have been, Applicant believes that the specification is clearly understandable and not confusing.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites that the blocking arrangement comprises the bending devices which, in the initial position, are in blocking contact with the lower part, preventing the upper part from being moved in the direction of the lower part.

As shown, for example, in Figs. 5 and 6, and as described in the specification on page 5, line 28, to page 6, line 3, in the initial position, the bending devices 21, 22 are in blocking contact with the surface 46 of the lower part 5, preventing the upper part 6 from being moved in the direction of the lower part.

The blocking arrangement recited in Claim 1 has no counterpart in Eriksson, the reference relied upon in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The rejection refers to the spring 16 as a lower part and asserts that the bending devices 4 and latches 14 provide a blocking arrangement such that the upper part 12 is blocked from being moved in a downward direction. Respectfully, this is not true.

Spring 16 is in the form of a metal wire bent into an open rectangle and mounted on the spring holder 15, which is integral with the block 12. The spring 16 engages the bending devices 4 for urging them into abutment against the stop lugs 14, i.e., to the starting position. The bending devices 4 are mounted on pivot shafts 5 integral with the block 12, and the stop lugs 14 are also integral with block 12. See column 4, lines 30-41, of Eriksson.

Since the bending devices 4, the stop lugs 14, and the spring 16 are all integral with or mounted on the block 12, parts 4 and 14 can not possibly block any downward movement of part 12.

Accordingly, Claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon distinguish patentably from Eriksson and should be allowed.

This application is believed to be clearly in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for

allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (XA-10592) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Nelson H. Shapiro
Nelson H. Shapiro
Reg. No. 17,095

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
(703) 610-8687

May 5, 2008